

PA

AN
APOLOGY
FOR THE
New Separation:

In a LETTER to
Dr. John Sharpe, Archbishop of YORK;
OCCASIONED
By his Farewell-Sermon, preached on the 28th of
June, at St. Giles's in the Fields.

MALACHI II. 7, 8, 9.

*The Priest's Lips should keep Knowledge, and they should seek the Law at his Mouth;
for he is the Messenger of the Lord of Hosts.*

*But ye have departed out of the Way, ye have caused many to stumble at the Law, ye
have corrupted the Covenant of Levi, saith the Lord of Hosts.*

*Therefore have I also made you contemptible and base before all the People, according as
ye have not kept my ways, but have been partial in the Law.*

L O N D O N,
Printed in the Year M DC XCI.

✓

To the Gentlemen of the Vestry of St. Giles's in the Fields.

SIRS,

I Here present you with some Reflections upon the Arch-Bishop of York's Farewel-Sermon, which his Grace tells us be Published at your Request: They are written in form of a Letter to him; and as I present them to you with as much Respect, and in as much Christian Charity, as he, I believe, presented the Sermon; so I hope you will read them with as much Candour, and examine impartially, without any byass to Persons or Causes, which is in the Right, and whether the Things which you took upon his Grace's Authority, be so or no. I must do him the Justice to acknowledge, That he is an eminent Person in his Profession, as well as in that station which he now holds in the Church, and that he deserves that Esteem and Veneration which you have for him: But then I must tell you, That the Authority of no single Man, or number of Men, how eminent or great soever, ought to signify any thing with Church of England Men, against the Authority of the Church. I have seen her Articles and Homilies in many of the London-Vestries; and if they be in yours, I desire you to make them the Test of my Lord's Sermon, and this Answer to it, which I desire may be approved, or rejected by you, as it happens to prove by that Test.

See, I pray you, Gentlemen, if you can find any thing in them to countenance transferring Allegiance from a living and claiming Legal King, or daily Praying for his destruction: See if you can find any thing in them that will justify his Grace's Exposition of 1 Tim. 11. 1, 2. or of Submitting, or Praying for the Powers in being, without distinction or regard to Titles, which he says, Is the very Doctrine of the Church of England. If Pag. 5. it be, you may surely easily find it; but if you cannot find it, or any thing like it, then you may be sure it is not the Doctrine of the Church, though it may be the Doctrine Preach'd of late in the Churches, and then you will have occasion to follow the Apostle's advice, which is, not to have the Persons of Men in Admiration, and to remember what our Lord often incul-

cated to his Disciples, to beware whom, and how they heard. There are some times in which this advice is more needful than others; and this, I think, is such a time, when our Church-men are divided in their Practice, and about some practical Points; and whether the greater or smaller number is in the Right, you will never be able to judge, though it concerns your Souls to judge aright, unless you will hear what both say.

There are Men of equal Eminence and Learning on both sides, and if one side can pretend the Advantage of Numbers, the other can urge against it the interest of saving, and getting more, to deprectate the Number and Authority of their Examples, together with a multiform variety of most different Opinions, and Principles among them; one of them complying in one sense, and upon one Principle, and another upon another.

This Book of mine is a short and summary Apology for the little suffering Number, against the Arguments and Accusations of the Arch-Bishop, who is now at the head of the other Party; and if it can prevail with you to look more narrowly into the Controversie, in which you have engaged his Grace, I shall think my self sufficiently recompenced for my little Pains in Writing of it; and in Hopes that you, or some of you, who have most leisure and ingenuity, will do so, I Subscribe in all Sincerity,

Gentlemen,

Your most Faithful,

and Humble Servant.

A N

(I)

AN APOLOGY FOR THE New Separation.

MY LORD,

I Once had the Happiness to hear you preach an excellent Sermon in which you spoke many excellent *things that were true and just*, with all that serious Air and Authority that could become a sincere Preacher, I often had occasion since to wish it had been put in Print; it was preached at *St. Margaret's Westminster*, on the 20th of *January* was two years, before the Gentlemen of the *Convention*, and remembering the excellent Discourse you then made, and pressed upon the Consciences of the *Conventioners*, I had a great Desire and Curiosity to read your late *fare-well Sermon*, to see if you stood firm in these times of *Detection* to your former Principles: But to be plain and serious with you, I find you so altered, like many of your Brethren, from your self, that though *Dr. Sharpe* is still the same Person, yet I do not find that the *Dean of Norwich* and the *Archbishop* are the same Man: For then, my Lord, you preach'd with great appearance of Zeal and Sincerity *against the resisting and deposing Doctrines*; for which you had the Honour to be censured by many of the *House*; but now in the very Phrase and Language of those Authors who have taught the World those damnable Doctrines, you tell us that *we must be more concerned for our Countrey and Nation, than the Interest of any single Man in it*; A Saying certainly in the sense you must needs mean it, fitter for a Bishop of the *Romish* than the *English* Church, which, conformably to our Laws, and the eternal Reasons of them, teacheth her Children, That *the Interest of the People is wrapt up with the Safety and Interest of the Prince, and that they can never be happy without him*. This our Ancestors have often felt, and confessed upon Experience, particularly *Mr. Bryn*, in his Preface to *Cotton's Abridgment*, to whose Words I refer you: But you, my Lord, contrary to all Law, Reason, and Experience, have taught the People in this Sermon to set up a separate and distinct Interest against that of the Prince, and by consequence to resist or depose him, to turn or keep him out of his Kingdom,

B

dom, be he who he will, even the present; as well as any of our former Kings.

You cannot but know that there are a party of Men among us, who are more concerned for *another Interest* than the Interest of the King, I mean the *Common-wealthman*, and they thinking that *Interest*, which I assure you is a growing Interest, the Interest of their Countrey, they may upon your Principles do as much for his Majesty as the Pretenders of *Publick Good* in former Ages have done by some of his Royal Ancestors, if they can but once persuade the People, who are easily deceived, or a considerable number of them, that it is not for the Interest of the Nation that he should longer reign over them. The least the People so persuaded would probably say of their Majesties in a time of general defection would be in the Words of Dr. Sherlock, *Let them go, if they cannot defend themselves*; and when they were gone, (which all their faithfull Subjects pray God to forbid,) they would think it their Duty to shut the door after them; for you, and such as you, would presently exhort them to *study to be quiet, and doe their own business*; and to be more concerned for their Countrey and Nation, than [to break the Peace of it] for the Interest of any single Man, or Woman in it, as their Majesties would then be styled. Nay, this great Concern of yours for our Country and Nation, in opposition to the Interest of the Prince, will justifie any thing as well as being quiet or sitting still. It exposes him to *Ehud's Dagger*, as well as *Gideon's Sword*, to Assassins and Bravoes, as well as to Rebels, Deposers, and High Courts of Justice, for a Prince in your Arithmetick is but a *single Man*, and if his Safety and Interest is not in Reality or Opinion consistent with that of the People, they may dispatch or depose him any way, it matters not how, a *Ravilliac* or a *Clement* may doe the Work with a *Steeletto*, when a League or Association cannot doe it. Princes at this rate can be no longer safe than they continue in the good opinion of the People, and are looked upon to be good Men, and encouragers of true Religion. As long as the Case is so, you say, they are not *only to be submitted to*, but to be acknowledged as Blessings: But by the Rule of Contraries, If they come to be, or, which is all one, happen to be thought bad Men by the People, and Encouragers of false Religion, as *Henry the 4th of France*, and *Charles the 1st of England* were, then they are no longer to be acknowledged as Blessings, but to be resisted, deposed or murdered as Curses, and no Man ought to be concerned at it, but to be quiet, and let the Deliverers of the People doe their Work their own way; for as you intimate the King is but a single Man, and the Interest of the Countrey which others call the *Publick Good*, is to be preferred without Exception before the Interest, *i. e.* before the Welfare and safety of any Particular Man.

I profess, my Lord, I cannot but wonder that any Government should prefer Men that turn Subjects to it upon such loose and dangerous Principles, as are equally destructive of all Governments, and can secure none: For this Doctrine upon which your Exhortation is founded, undermines Senates, as well as Kings; for as a King, my Lord, is with you but a single Man; so by the same figure in Politicks, Senates are but a few single Men met together, and so the People in parity of Reason

son ought at all times to be more concerned for their Countrey than a few single Men. Nay, my Lord, by this Doctrine the minor Part, in a pure Democracy, can never want a plausible pretence of resisting the major, in whose Determinations they ought to acquiesce; for though they are the *minor*, they may always pretend to be a *sounder* Part, that are more concerned for their Countrey than for the *Interest* of any number of Men, though never so great; and so at this rate there can be no Peace in any Nation or Government, but eternal Opposition without a powerful standing Army, which is an uncertain state of Peace; a Peace as long as it endures attended with Oppression, Poverty, and Slavery, and not much better for the People than a State of War. Nay, my Lord, you will find that this Principle of yours will ruine Bishops as well as Kings; for when Sir George Mackenzy, and others of the Episcopal Party, defended the Bishops of Scotland in the Convention of that Kingdom, *What a doe*, said a Presbyterian Lord, *is here about the Bishops, I think we ought to be more concerned for our Countrey than the Interest of Twelve Men.*

It was of such Latitude as this of yours, and such Latitudinarians as you are, that Dr. Sherlock complained, not long before he had taken the Oaths, had ruined both the Church and State. He then saw how such loose Doctrines as yours made them both Obnoxious to an everlasting rotation of Turns and Revolutions, and was not sparing in his Reflections and Invectives upon one whom he thought the *Arch-Latitudinarian*; but as Dr. Collins said, at Cambridge— *Then was then, but now is now*; for since that he hath left the narrow for the wide and easie Way, or if I may compare Principles, as you do Religion to Cloaths, he hath changed his old freight uneasy Fashion, for the newer easie Mode; he hath cast off the slavish Principles of strict and inflexible Loyalty to his Prince, his Soul is no longer fettered with them, but is as free as the happy Liberty of Obeying any *Regnant Powers* can make him. It matters not with you or him, my Lord, what the King be, lawful or unlawful, real or titular, rightful or wrongful, provided he be in Possession of the Throne. Thus let Twenty Kings supplant one another, and you can transfer your Allegiance to the later, though you have recognized and sworn Allegiance never so solemnly to the former, and declared that no Power can absolve you from that Oath, nay though you have made a *vow to God* of Obedience to him, and he actually claims his Right, and prosecutes his Claim, and charges his Subjects to keep their Allegiance entire for him; yet notwithstanding all this you can turn Subjects to him that usurps his Throne, though he got it and keep it never so unjustly. like the Gentleman's Spaniel, who forsook his Master, and followed the Thief, after he had knocked him down and got upon his Horse.

Thus with you, and such as you, my Lord, whoever can mount *Bucephalus* will be your *Alexander*, whoever can get into the Throne shall certainly be your *Cæsar*; if God should suffer a *Cromwell* to destroy their Majesties, and seize the Crown, you would own him and be Subject to him; and pray publicly for him in the Regal Style, because St. Paul hath said, That every Soul must be subject, and hath bid us *put up Prayers, and Supplications, and Intercessions for all Men, especially*

for Kings, and all that are in Authority, without any distinction or restriction what Kings, or what Persons in Authority we are to pray for, and what not:

From these Words, my Lord, I presume to conjecture upon what Principles you took the Oath; for being asked in Company some time since why you did not write a Book to persuade Men to take the *New Oath*, you replied to this effect, That you believed you could write Satisfactorily upon the Subject; but you were afraid *the Government would not like your Reasons*; and in truth, my Lord, you had reason for what you said; for no Government can like this time-serving and precarious Principle of *Swearing Allegiance unto Princes*: Indeed a distressed Government may connive at it in a time of Exigence, but it can never approve it; it may be content with it upon Force, when it can have Allegiance paid upon no better terms; but when it grows strong enough it will despise such beggarly Elements of Subjection, bring the Authors of them to condign Punishment, and order their Books to be burnt by the hand of the Common Hang-man.

For my own part I am not afraid to tell your Grace, that I hope to see such Bishops and Priests become Base and Contemptible, in the Eyes both of King and People, that expound St. Paul as you and Dr. Sherlock have done, contrary to the Rules of moral Equity and Justice, and advance Allegiance to the Government upon a Principle that is destructive to it, and the true and lasting Peace of the Kingdom in which our Happiness does consist. No Divines of the Church of England but you and Dr. Sherlock, and a few more since the Revolution, ever so expounded *Rom. 13. 1.* and *1 Tim. 11. 1, 2.* and I have so good Opinion of the Constancy of our Clergy to their Principles, that I verily believe were your Exposition proposed to the Convocation, they would condemn it as contrary to right Reason, and the moral Duties of Religion, according to which all the general and unlimited Precepts in the Gospel concerning *relative Duties*, ought to be limited and understood. Doth not Nature it self, at first hearing, teach us that the Apostle by *higher Powers* and *Kings*, in those two places, meant rightful *higher Powers* and *Kings*? And will not you your self grant, that in other places where he, or other Apostles exhorts, Children to obey their Parents, Wives to obey their Husbands, Servants their Masters, and the People their Pastors, that he means only such as are truly and rightfully so, though according to your own Observation, *He makes no restriction, or distinction what Fathers, Husbands, Masters and Pastors, are to be obeyed, and what not?* But you imply that the reason of this Exhortation to pray for Kings is general; and are not the Reasons as general upon which he exhorts us to perform our relative Duties to our other Superiours, as hath been observed in the several learned Answers to Dr. Sherlock? to which I humbly refer your Grace for your better information in the following Order, as I have read them with great Delight and Satisfaction: *The Title of an Usurper after a thorough Settlement examined, p. 39 and forwards. The Duty of Allegiance settled upon its true Grounds according to Scripture and Reason, Chap. 3. Dr. Sherlock's Case of Allegiance considered, Sect. 3. The Examination of the Arguments drawn from Scripture and Reason, in Dr. Sherlock's Case of Allegiance; in the Examination of Sect. 4. Pag. 28.*

I have

I have taken upon me to direct your Grace to these particular places, in hopes that you will read them, and impartially examine the Reason of these learned Authors against Dr. Sherlock's way of Expounding the Apostle, *Rom. 13. 1.* and by consequence against your own, who after this manner have expounded the Apostle's Precept of Praying for Kings, in a Sense as unlimited, as he hath done the other of Subjection to them; viz. of Praying for Kings without distinction, provided they are in Possession of the Throne.

These Explications, my Lord, as some Men think, reflect upon their Majesties and the Acts of Recognition; and if you have no more to say to justify your Praying for them, *Exultabunt Jacobei*, the Adversaries, I fear, will have occasion to triumph.

My Lord, I could name some great Men among you, who when they were directed to read some of *their Books*, replied that they were *satisfied*, and desired not to be unsettled, but I expect better things from a Person of your Candour and Ingenuity: Nay, my Lord, I think you are bound in Honour and Conscience, to examine your Adversaries Reasons against the unlimited Sense of the Apostle's Exhortations, for fear you should happen to be in the wrong, and continue to delude the People by an Exposition of his Words apparently contrary to the dictates of natural Reason, and by consequence to the meaning of that holy Spirit by which the Apostle wrote.

You cannot but know that this *unlimited Sense*, in which you expounded the Apostle, is of *ill Fame*, and hath been generally disapproved by the learned Divines of our Church; it was insisted on in the times of the late Usurpation by Phanatical time-serving Writers, but rejected with disdain by the Martyrs and Confessors of Loyalty among the Suffering Clergy-men, as it now is by the *Jacobians*. It was so expounded by Mr. Jenkins, who in the late Usurpation argued for Subjection, as Dr. Sherlock doth now, and was ever after infamous for it, and exposed without Mercy: for it by your old Acquaintance Dr. Grove, now Bishop of Chichester, as you may see in the Margent. †

Farewell Sermon, p. 15. It is

a most excellent Preservative against Tower-hill. But what is this famed Position of the Doctor's? As far as I can learn it was laid down in these very Words, or to this purpose, *Regimen Politicum fundatur in Providentia Dei Extraordinaria.*

This Mr. Jenkins calls his asserting *Providential Disposal*, though one might conjecture what this means, yet it had not been so clear without the Comment, which he has made upon it in the beginning of his humble Petition to the Supreme Authority, the Parliament of the Common-wealth of England; in short it is this: That whoever they be that get the Power into their hands, the Providence of God evidently appears in removing others, and investing them with the Government, and he looks upon it as his Duty to yield to this Authority all active and cheerful Obedience, even for Conscience sake.

This is a fine plausible Principle as a Man can wish, 'twill lap about your Finger like Barbary Gold. Thus when King Charles the First, of blessed Memory, had the Power in his hands, this was an Extraordinary Providence, and the Right of Government was in him: But stay, it may be the Doctor had not studied the point so soon. But to be sure when the Parliament got the better, that was an Extraordinary Providence indeed, and then indeed without doubt they were the Supreme Authority, as this Petitioner styles them; and so was Oliver Cromwell, and so was Richard, and so was the Rump, and so was the Committee

mittee of Safety, and so was I know not who, and so round until his Majesties most happy Restauration; and then because there was an Extraordinary Providence in that, so is he too, and so Mr. Jenkins is as good a Subject as can be desired, and so he had been whoever had come. And thus if the Turk should happen to o'r-run the Kingdom of Poland, and deliver the People from Popish Tyranny, this were an Extraordinary Providence, and the Grand Seignior would presently become the lawful Sovereign of that Realm, and that (which the proud Mahometan little thinks) by virtue of a Position made at Cambridge above Twenty Years ago:

I have considered it as well as I am able, and cannot make the Doctor's Providentia Extraordinaria to signifie any more in effect, than what they call Mr. Hobbs's Potentia Irresistibilis, and then the Doctor, and he, and our Author, have been the on'y Torcs, for ought I know, that have perfectly agreed in this uncomth, and 'till of late unheard of Point, that unscutles the Foundations of the Earth, and gives a liberty to every bold Usurper that invades the Crown, at least legimates his Claims, if he can be but Successful enough to place it on his own Head.

But Mr. Jenkins must know, that though this assertion be a good Expedient to secure ones Neck under an illegal and tyrannical Power, yet it never can make him a faithful Subject to his natural and lawful Prince; or it robs him of his Title, which he hath by Inheritance, and justifies every thing by Event onely. It adds Affliction to the Misery of unfortunate Kings, and flatters the prosperous Traitor, as if he were the Darling of Heaven.

Nay, you cannot but be conscious to your self, that two Years ago you were not of opinion, at least you were not fully persuaded, that the Text allowed us to pray in behalf of a King *de Facto* against the King *de Jure*, or in behalf of a King in Possession against the legal King, as you and Dr. Sherlock still acknowledge King James to be, though he is out of Possession; or, else why did you at his House, in the Temple, express so much dislike and dissatisfaction at the Prayers in the Office of the first general Fast: But the World is since well minded with you, and what was matter of Difficulty to you then is not so now; for since that time you have better Studied the great Apostle at Canterbury than you did at Norwich, and plainly discovered that he is, and always was for the *Uppermost*, and directs us to pay our Allegiance and Devotion, without enquiring into Titles, to the King in the Throne.

I wish for the Honour of our Religion, and the better Settlement of the Nation, that these Norions had still remained among those *wish-our*, and not obtained admission within the pale of the Church, more especially I wish, for the Honour of the *holy Order*, that they had never been taught in Pulpits, at least by our Bishops and Dignified Churchmen, who are the more conspicuous Lights, and upon whom the Reputation of the Clergy depends. Certainly, my Lord, such *insecure* Doctrines to Princes, when once they come to understand them, cannot be very acceptable to them, nor can they much value such *Protean* Subjects, as will bow the Knee to them to day, and do the same to their greatest Enemies to morrow, if they can get into their Thrones. I doubt not but *their Majesties*, when they have leisure to reflect, will be sensible how much such Men impose upon them, and how little Security they have

have in their Allegiance, though they pretend to transfer it all unto them, because it is a temporary and a moveable Allegiance, which they can transfer *in infinitum*, and veer backwards and forwards, or come about to every point of the Compass, like the Weather-cocks upon their Church-steeple, as the Wind shall blow. My Lord, one *Jacobite*, could he turn to their *Majesties* upon his own Principles, would be worth an hundred such Subjects as you and Dr. *Sherlock*; and whenever Providence shall remove the Obstacles which lie in the way of their Allegiance to them, they will have reason to value them as so many Jewels of their Crown.

My Lord, I cannot deny but that I like the Conversation of the Men, cause they are Men of Conscience, and Honour, and discourse, and write like Scholars and Christians, though Dr. *Sherlock* calls them little Writers; this makes me keep Company with them, and so I do with some Men of Parts among the *Republicans*, and so I would do with *Aristotle*, *Plato*, and *Socrates*, were they alive, and see how they liked your Principle of tying Allegiance to actual Administration. I will not tell you what they say of you at *Richards*, for I am afraid it might ruffle your smooth Temper, to let you know how unmercifully those Gentlemen tear your Rocket without any regard to your venerable Character, but the *Jacobites* are more respectful to it upon Principle; and I will spend the rest of my Time and Paper in letting you know what they reply to every thing you have said against them, from the 25th Page to the end of your Sermon, in which you have exposed them as on a Stage, first to your Parish, and then to the whole Kingdom.

They observe then, my Lord, that you might have exhorted your People to study Peace and Unity, and endeavour in their several Stations to promote the publick Tranquillity, without pointing at them as disturbers of it; and they say they have reason to think that you have done it, with a design to provoke both the Government and People against them, and to that end they suspect it is that you represent them as a Faction, more especially as a Faction in Religion, and tell the World they ground their Faction on a State-point, or, as you afterwards explain your self, upon a mere State point. This, my Lord, is the great Charge you draw up against them; and they pretend that it is none of the things of your Text, as being neither True, Honest, nor Just; and they wonder they could be so falsely charged by a learned Man, who can distinguish very well, though common Readers and Hearers cannot, betwixt a State-point, and a mere point of State. These two things they say are very different, though you fallaciously confound them together, and therefore they distinguish betwixt a State-point, which is purely such, and a State-point which happens also to be a point of Morality or practical Religion, and in its Nature affects the Consciences of Men. As for Example—The *Spanish Match*, say they, in the time of *James the First*, was a State point, i. e. a mere State-point, which, had it been effected, could not have obliged any Man in Conscience (though the Clergy preached against it) to refuse Communion with the Church, or Submission to the State. The Vote of Non-addressing was also a State-point; but then say they, not a mere State-point, but such an one as

was

was withall a matter of Morality, which many of the Members thought in their Consciences a great breach of their Duty to concur with, and therefore left the House.

Wherefore, my Lord, they appeal to you, and the whole *Casistical* World, if a *State-point*, and more particularly a point of Government or Policy, may not become a *Case of Conscience* in a Kingdom, as well as in a Family, College, or Diocese; and whether Questions about Right and Wrong, Lawful and Unlawful, Just and Unjust, may not happen to arise in a *Point*, or Act of State, as well as in other practical Points?

Was not *the Engagement* a State-point in those times? And did not the *Presbyterians* make a Case of Conscience of it, and chose many of them to suffer rather than to take it, because they thought the matter of it sinful? Was it not a State-point with the Loyal Nobility, Gentry, and Clergy, whether they should turn Liege-subjects to *Oliver*? And yet because it was not a mere *State-point*, but such an one as touched their Consciences, they chose to be sequestred rather than sin in closing with the Usurpers, and transfer their Allegiance from the King to whom they thought it due: The Clergy also then set up separate Meetings from the Churches, and Private Worship in opposition to the Publick, in many places of the Kingdom, as Dr. *Wild* and Dr. *Gunning* in *London*, and Dr. *Fell* in *Oxon*; for then they thought it was not the *Place*, or the *Numbers*, but the *Cause* that made the Separation a Schism; and the *Jacobites* in like manner think (how truly I shall not now dispute) that they have just Cause of Separation given them, and that therefore their Separation is no Schism. The New Oath of Allegiance which you intimate to be a mere *State-point*, they think withall to be a great Point of Religion, in which the Interests of Truth, Justice, and moral Honesty are concerned, and they verily believe they cannot take it without breaking three or four of the Commandments, which they think to be as sacred in themselves, and as dear to God that made them, as any Articles in the *Creed*: For the same Reason they profess they cannot join in the Prayers as they stand altered, nor with the additional Prayers; and to speak my own Judgment, I think no Party of Men ever made a more plausible Apology or Defence for themselves, than is made for them in a Book called *Christian Prudence*, to which I refer your Grace, and I dare say you will not think your Pains ill spent in reading of it, if you please to peruse it with a free and unprejudicate Mind.

But, my Lord, besides that which you call a *State-point*, there is also a *Church-point*, of which you take no notice, though it be another known Cause of their Separation, and that is the putting of New Bishops into the Thrones of the Old ones, whose Deprivation they pretend to be null and unjust, and give such Reasons for it, as the tender Regard I have for the Government, and these *Erastian* Times will not suffer me to recite. I have urged the Authority of the *Barocian Manuscript*, against them; but to that they answer many ways very well, and, which troubles me not a little, they assure from their Friends at *Oxford*, that Mr. *Hady* hath not printed the whole Manuscript, but omitted a *Collection of Canons*, which immediately follows where he left off, written in the same Hand, which shews that the Author is to be understood

flood of Synodical Deprivations; and if this be so indeed, as I fear it is, ‡ Jam ad then I must say, that Mr. Hody hath not strictly kept his ‡ Vow; †at alia, Lector, least he hath printed the providential Manuscript in two Languages, to procedas; at little or no purpose, and amused the learned World in vain. *pruſquam procedas, Votorum quorundam mihi teſtis eſto; E olim, ſi unquam violavero, Monitor; Votorum quorundam eruditus Viris, prob dolor! hucusque ignotorum; ſed quæ ego perpetuò à primis literis, ut facio, ſeci ex Cordæ:*

Fuxit Numen,

*Ut vel æterno ego ſilentio inter non ſcribentes deliteſcam,
Vel ſemper, ut virum ingenium, liberalis ac generoſæ Educationis,
Veræque Philoſophiæ ſtudioſum deceat, ſcribam:*

*Veritas unica Indagator,
Abſque omni Styli Acerbitate,
Mitis, urbanus, candidus,*

*Ad id quod indecens eſt aſſeo non pronus, ut nec movendus,
Nugarum denique Contemptor.*

I do not know whether Ger. Joh. and Isaac Voſſius, Uther and Dodwell, ever made ſuch a Vow; but this I dare ſay, if they had printed this 2d & 3d Manuscript, they would have had ſo much Ingenuity as to have printed the whole, at leaſt to have given Reaſons to the World why they did not.

Thus, my Lord, you ſee that the Non-compliance and Separation of our New Nonconformiſts is not grounded upon a mere State point; ſo neither merely upon a Point of State, and they think they have Reaſon to expect ſatisfaction from your Grace, not only for wrong aſſign'g one Cauſe of their Separation, but alſo for not aſſigning both. I confeſs their Opinion is dreadful in its conſequence, as being like to involve all the Nation except themſelves in Schiſm, and I have been ſo free as to tell them of it, and alſo prayed them to conſider what an Odium they will bring upon themſelves by it; but to that they ſay, they cannot hinder the Conſequences of things, and wiſhed me to conſider, That as a Nation, or Province, may fall into Idolatry, Rebellion, or Sacrilege, ſo alſo into Schiſm, and that our Nation fell into the firſt of theſe Sins in the time of Queen Mary, into the ſecond and third in the time of the Rump and Cromwell, and if they now charge it with the fourth Sin, it is no more than what your Grace, and your complying Brethren do for Scotland, and the ſame Apology they think will ſerve for both, though of the two they acknowledge the Scottiſh to be the more grievous Schiſm.

Thus much, my Lord, I have ſaid by way of Enquiry into the Grounds of the Separation of the Jacobites, to acquit them from the Charge of Faction and Schiſm, I now come to your Reflections, which they ſay are as unjuſt as your Charge, and as groundleſs and impertinent as it. You repreſent them in p. 26. as Men that have different Notions about Politicks, and framers of Hypotheſes about Government. To which they reply, That if you mean that their Notions of Politicks are different from yours, that they confeſs to be true; but if you mean that their Notions about Politicks are different from the true Engliſh Polity, or antient Government of this Kingdom, or that they frame any other Hypotheſis about it, than what the Law hath framed; this they deny, and deſire all the World to take notice, That they are by Principle ſo far from making Hypo-

shewes against the Government of *England*, or Alterations in it, that they suffer both as *Christians* and *Englishmen* for their strict Adherence to it, and that you are the Men that have different Notions of *Politicks*, from the National Polity or Constitution, and that you have actually framed six or seven *Hypotheses* about Government, as different from one another as from the Law it self.

For the truth of this they appeal to your own Writings, out of which they intend to collect such notorious Schemes of State-Notions, and Doctrines of Politicks, that *they that dwell on the Earth shall wonder at them*, as at the Beast in the *Revelations*, when they beheld them. One of them, as I am told, hath been at the pains to compare Dr. *Sherlock's* Notions about Politicks with those of *Julian Johnson's*, and can make it appear from that Collation, that *Julian* is much the better Church-man, and the more Orthodox *Apostate* of the two. In short, my Lord, in answer to this Reflexion upon them, as Coiners of Notions about Politicks, they stick not to say, that you are the *Statists* and *Politicians*, who with your humane Policies have corrupted your Religion, defiled the Priesthood, dishonoured the Church, scandalized her Friends, and caused her Enemies to triumph.

Page 27.

In the next Paragraph you say, That *it is very grievous for those that promote a Separation, who have always declared themselves Friends to the Church, and Enemies to Schism*. To this Reflexion they reply, That they are still as much Friends of the Church, and Enemies of Schism, as ever; but then by the Church they understand the *True Old Church* of *England*, with all her venerable Doctrines of Faith, Justice, and moral Honesty, and all her strict Decrees against the *resisting*, *deposing*, and *forfeiting* Doctrines; the Church of *England* with all her plain Primitive Doctrines of Christian Honesty and Simplicity, against *Equivocations* and *Mental Reservations*; the Church that always abhorred *Treason* and *Perjury*, as well as *Idolatry*; that never allowed her Children to *do any moral Evil for a good End, or with a good Intention*: In a word, the Church that equally condemns both the Parts of Popery, that which teaches us to be false to Men, as well as that which is injurious to God; that which pollutes our Morals, as well as that which pollutes our Faith and Worship. This pure Virgin Church, which they think is now driven once more into the Wilderness, they say is the Church which they adhere to, and to which they think you ought to have adhered with them, and that you have separated from her, and them, and not they from you: For they say, they are just where they were when you were last with them, and have not budged a Foot since from that Church, and that you cannot say they have broken from you, unless you will affirm that when a Ship breaks from the Shoar where she lay at Anchor, the Shoar removes from her, and not she from the Shoar.

And then as to the next Reflexion, of *being distasted at the establishment of Worship, for which they were zealous before*, they say they are as zealous for it as ever, as far as the *Matter of the Prayers is the same*; but the *Matter* of some of the old Prayers they say is changed, and this *Matter*, with that of all the New ones, being the subject *Matter* of the New Oath of Allegiance, they have the same Difficulty of Conscience upon them, as to saying of these, as taking of those: Wherefore, in Answer

swear to your fallacious Question about the Liturgie and Prayers, they desire to know if you put the Question of the whole Liturgie, and all the Prayers in it, or not: If not, then the Question is not to your purpose; but if you indeed mean the whole Liturgy, and all the Prayers in it, as you would be understood, then, they say, they must tell you that the Liturgy and Prayers are not the same they were, and by consequence, that the Proposition implied in your Question is false: For as changing the Name of God for the Virgin Mary, in the *invocatory* part of any Collect in the Liturgy, would change the Object of Worship, and make it not as it was, a Prayer to God, but to the Virgin; so changing the Name of a Man for that of his Enemy, in the *petitionary* part of any Collect, makes it quite another Prayer, not for the Man as it was before the Change of Names, but for his Enemy; and by consequence, alteration of Names alters the Matter and Intention of the Prayer, and makes it as different from it self, as the two Men and their Interests happen to be. They suppose, that if a Man should raze the Names out of a Petition to their Majesties, and put the French King's Name in their place, that it would no longer be a Petition to them, but to their mortal Enemy; and therefore in Reply to the next Question which follows about the *same Liturgie*, they say, this change of Names has changed the Prayers in the Liturgie, and that this change disgusts their Consciences, and helps to drive them from your Churches, being one cause of their Separation from the Publick, and but one; for as I just now shewed your Grace, there was another, of which you were pleased to take no notice.

Ay, but you say, *they proceed so far as to declare open War, and set up separate Congregations in opposition to the publick*. To this they say, for the foresaid Reasons, That they did not begin this spiritual War, which on their side is purely *Defensive*, because they are driven from the Publick, and that the same Reasons that will justify their Separation from it, will also justify setting up separate Meetings in opposition to it, in which they think the pure Church of *England*, with her pure Worship, may be seen and heard like the Church of *Jerusalem*, in the first persecution of Christianity, in the upper rooms. And in reply to the great Emphasis, which, to supply the want of Argument, you put upon Separating from the *Publick*, and Setting up Congregations in opposition to the *Publick*, they pray you to consider, That the Multitude, or great Majority which usually makes the *Publick*, is often in the wrong. You will not deny but the Multitude or Publick are now the Schismatics in *Scotland*; they were so under the Donatist Bishops in *Africa*; they were so in *England* under the Popish *Marian* Bishops; they were so under *Aaron* in the business of the Calf; they were so in *Israel* under *Ahab* and the Idolatrous Priests; and, lastly, they were so under the *Arian* Emperours and Bishops, throughout the whole *Roman* Empire. In short, my Lord, they say when the Publick is in the right, and gives no just cause of separating from it, that then it is a great Sin, to set up private Meetings against it; but when it is in the wrong, and gives just cause of separating, it then becomes innocent, and a Duty to doe so, though the *Publick* be in Possession of all the Churches, as it usually is, when Safety, Honour, and Riches attend the erring side.

I hope by this time, my Lord, you understand *what their Meaning is in Setting up separate Congregations*; for it is the Cause, and not the local Churches and Revenues that make, say they, a true Church; and therefore, in Answer to your Question, they pray your Grace to consider, that Men *that have been branders of Schism*, may think it not only innocent, but their Duty to separate from the Publick, or publick Worship, without changing their Principles. Nay, sometimes their Principles, unless they can change them, will oblige them to do so, though they do not think *Schism can change its Nature*; and this they think is their own Case; and therefore they challenge you, and the whole Regnant Church of *England*, with all the advantage of its Churches and Revenues, but more particularly the *Intruders*, as they do not stick to call them, and all their *Electors and Consecrators*, to prove that their Separation is a Schism. All your Arguments about it are couched in a few trifling Questions, of which this that follows is a terrible one, *Have we not the same Government in Church and State that we formerly had?* And they appeal to your Grace's Conscience, upon second Thoughts, and as you expect to be called to Account for the *Sincerity of your Answer at the dreadfull Tribunal of God*, if we have the same Government we formerly had. Do you know of no Changes it hath undergone, which may reasonably affect the Mind of every true Englishman, as well as the Conscience of a good Subject? Was there no substantial Reason for throwing the Word *rightfull* out of the New Oath of Allegiance? Or for the Declaration that so many made for the ease of their Consciences at the taking of it? And do not many among you still complain in private of the Alterations that the Revolution hath made in the Government, and wish them-unmade again. You cannot but know, they say, that there are many *Grumbletonians*, and half Penitents among you; and therefore they wonder with what Confidence you could put this Question about the Government, as well as that about the Prayers.

But they say your Question is fallacious, because it is not to be put about the Government but about the Governours, and they think you will not say, that they are the same. They also make some distinctions about Things and Titles, which I shall not here recite, because, I believe, your Grace hath heard of them, and knows them to be very material in Controversies of Allegiance, of which Praying for the King, next to Fighting for him, is a principal part; and therefore they say that in contests about Crowns in Christian Kingdoms, the Subjects at the peril of their Souls are bound to consider for which of the contesting Princes it is their Duty to pray, as well as for which it is to fight.

The next Question to this, say they, is as little to the purpose, wherein you ask, *Have we not the same Articles and Doctrines of Religion publicly owned, and professed, and taught, without the least alteration?* To this they Answer, That there are many Doctrines relating to the Controversie between you and them, *taught, licensed, and allowed*, which have been condemned by your Predecessors of the Church of *England* in the late Usurpation, and formerly, and of late censured by the famous University of *Oxford*, and which they verily believe a free Convocation would yet censure, as contrary to the Doctrine of the Church of *England*;

gland; such as these are, the *Resisting*, the *Deposing*, the *Forfeiting* Doctrines, which are to be seen in your licensed Tracts. The Doctrine in behalf of bare Possession, that it gives a Right to a Crown, to which another King hath a legal Title, that will justify a recuperative War; the Doctrine of Providence, and actual Administration, the Doctrine which makes War God's Court, and Victory his Sentence lately asserted by the Bishop of St. Asaph. The Doctrine of laying aside Kings for *Moral Incapacity*, and another fine Doctrine, that Force from what Cause soever will disengage Subjects from their Oaths of Allegiance, and justify their entering into contrary Obligations; and they appeal to your Grace's Conscience, if these Doctrines, not to mention others, which used to be so much branded and decryed by our Divines in Popish and Presbyterian Writers, be Articles of our Religion, or Doctrines of the Church of *England*--- and the Preaching and Printing these Doctrines with Allowance, not mentioning the Preferments Men have for Teaching of them, is an Argument, they say, that the Articles and Doctrines you speak of are not owned, but disowned, not professed but suppressed; and that they are not taught so publickly as formerly, because they are not pleasing, and some Men you know do not love to teach displeasing Things, though they be true, lovely, honest, and just.

But say you again, *What Government is there in the World will not meet with such Subjects that are not satisfied with it, and if that disaffection be a just Reason to break Communion with the Etablissement Church, what Ligaments have we to tie Christians together?* Here they say, my Lord, you couch a Fallacy, which it did not become your Grace to make for the dissatisfaction of Subjects, or rather, if you please, of the People against any Government, is, they say, of two sorts, *one* upon the account of want of a good Title in the Governours, and *another* upon the account of want of good Administration, and with respect to the later, they acknowledge, there are very few Governments, which have not in some measure dissatisfied their Subjects, but this sort of dissatisfaction, they say, is very consistent with Church Communion under any Government, though the Church-men should happen to favour the Maledministration, as sometimes they chance to do.

But then with respect to the former sort of dissatisfaction, which is upon a moral Account, they say, it becomes a just Reason to break off Communion with the Church, when an acknowledgment of Right in wrongful Governours, at whom they are so dissatisfied, is made a condition, or part of the Communion in the Prayers, and Sacraments of the Church, in the partaking of which Communion doth consist: In this case they say the change of Names in the Prayers, as to the use of them, affects the Consciences of People, as much as the change of them in the Oath of Allegiance; and therefore for the People to joyn in them, would not be *to hold the unity of the Spirit*, but to make themselves Parties to that which they think an unrighteous Usurpation, which would be a great Sin.

But you tell us again, *That great Revolutions have happened in all Ages and Countries, and that you believe it will not easily be found, that ever any Christians separated from the Church upon the account of them.* Here, my Lord, they distinguish again, and say, that Revolutions of Govern-
ment

ment are also of *two sorts*; one in which the new Governours happen to acquire a clear and undoubted Title to the Government, and the other when they acquire the Government without a clear and undoubted Title, which happens when another claims it by a clearer Title, and prosecutes his Claim. As to the first sort of Revolutions they acknowledge with your Grace, that never any Christians did, or ought to separate from the Church upon the account of them: But as to the second they assert, that they commence just Causes, as of Non-subjection, so of Separation, when owning the Right of the new Governours against the better Title, becomes not only a Condition to the Clergy of exercising their Ministry, but also a part both in Prayers and Sacraments of the daily Offices of the Church.

This, my Lord, is their Opinion; and had this ever been the Case of the Primitive Christians, as you wrongfully suggest it was, they doubt not but their Practice would have been answerable therunto: For the Primitive Christians. say they, were Christians all over, who served God faithfully in the most difficult, as well as most easie parts of Religion; they were as zealous for the practical as the speculative Doctrines of Christianity, and stood up as much for probity of Life, as purity of Faith, and Worship. In a word, they were as Righteous towards their Kings as towards God, and would have suffered as much for the Third, Fifth, Sixth, and Eighth Commandments, as for the First or Second, or any Doctrine of the Creed.

I have now, my Lord, repeated all the Answers which I have heard your Adversaries make to your *Queries*, and I must needs beg so much favour from you, as to consider me as the bare reciter of them; for the sufficiency of which, it is their part to undertake and not mine. But if they chance to prove sufficient Answers, to say no more of them; then to espouse the Party of those Men, will nor, as you tell your Parishoners, be to espouse a Faction, or a Communion which is not the Communion of the Church.

But you tell them *how uneasy soever some of them may be in joining with the* [altered and additional] *Prayers* [then it seems some are uneasy at the Prayers, and what is the reason of that? but] *they will be ten times more uneasy in separating from you*; which may be true, say they, with respect to outward ease, but not to the ease that is within. And truly, my Lord, they themselves are a sensible Example of what they say, for you may read perfect Contentment in their looks, and perceive by conversing with them, that they enjoy their Deprivations more than ever they enjoyed the Possessions of which they are depriv'd. Oh! my Lord, had you seen Him of *Palgrave-Court*. after his Extradition, you would have seen him look more Chearful, and Great, and Venerable than ever; and I seriously profess to you, I had rather have his inward Peace and Satisfaction, than his Throne with all its Revenues, and be in his Condition rather than that of any arrogant intruding Politician, who can scoff at him now, to whom he would have formerly cringed, and from whom, before the Revolution, he would have counted a smile a great favour; I wish the time may come, when both the insulting Scoffers may repent of it, lest another time should come upon them like travel upon a Woman, when they shall say in anguish of Spirit

Spirit--- O let me die the Death of That righteous Man, and let my latter end be like his.

Farthermore you tell your Parishoners of the Heat and Turbulency, the Passion and Peevishness, the bitter Zeal and Uncharitableness, that the being of a Party doth naturally engage Men in. This, my Lord, they acknowledge to be true in all Church and State Divisions, especially with respect to them that are engaged on the wrong Side. It is not my undertaking now to determine in this Division of our Church-men which Side is in the right; but this I can say, by experience from their Conversation, that those who have separated from the Publick, have for the kind as few, and for the degree as little of those troublesome Passions, as any sort of Men in the World: I appeal to your worthy Successor, in St. Giles's-Parish, if one of the new Bishops was not in a very disturbed, and uneasy paroxysm of Spirit about accepting his Bishoprick, and whether in a great heat of Passion he was not ready to go to her Majesty, like Dr. B. to desire to be excused. None of the deprived Bishops parted with their Bishopricks with half that reluctance, that some of the accepters took them: The Episcopal Seals were bespoke, and unbespoke, and at last after many Agonies and Fluctuations finally bespoke again. But the deprived are calm, and smooth, and uniform within, their Hearts are fixt on God, and their good Principles, they are as free from bitter Zeal, as from Shame and Remorse; and if you do not envy the Felicity of their Deprivations, I dare say they do not envy you their Revenues, and think you no reproach to them, if you do not think them so to you. But farther, my Lord, be the Passions never so great on both, or either side, upon the account of the Separation, Who must answer for that? Casuists say, that those that are the Cause of any War must answer to God for all the Blood that is shed, and all the Devastations that are committed in it; and so, I think, those that are the Cause of any Separation must answer to the God of Peace and Unity for the Division, and all the Heats and Passions and irregular Zeal, and Uncharitableness on both sides that's occasioned thereby. When there is Pope against Pope, Bishop against Bishop, there will be Feuds and Animosities; this is now the sad Condition of our other World, and let them look to it who have set up the *Seconds*, who in the Judgment of the *African Church* are none at all.

But you call the deprived, *warm Men*, and *some* that is a *few warm Men*. But as for their fewness, my Lord, they say as the Orthodox, or Catholicks used to say to the World of *Arians*, That no Cause is to be tried by Numbers, that the Number is often in the wrong, and that they are but *some* that will be saved; for the Truth of this I refer to their former instances, with which you used to stop the Mouths of the Papists, when they boasted of their *Numbers*; but I perceive from *your Writers*, that *Numbers*, and the *Publick*, are now become excellent Arguments for Truth. But then as for the imputation of *heat*, as they think it signifies not much, so they wonder you should reproach them as *hot Men*, who apparently have so many *Hot-heads* among your selves. Certainly, my Lord, had you called to mind your *PP-cks.* and *T--ns.* and *P--ns.* and *F--rs.* and *H--ns.* and *W--ms.* you would have spoken more respectfully of *heat*, and not have been so ready to reproach the *Jacobites* as *warm Men*:

Discourse about a Scrupulous Conscience. Epist. Dedictory, preach'd at Aldermanbury, 1683.

† Page 29.

Men: For the Philosophers, my Lord, that treat of the Passions, and the Use of them, tell us, that *Heat* is the active Principle, and as necessary in the moral as in the natural World, and a very cool Man, who since proved a *Jacobite*, once saying to another, *Brother, Brother, God send you Patience:* *Brother*, replied the warm Gentleman. *God send you more Passion; I am zealously affected in a good thing, and I wish you were so too.* And I remember your good old Friend, Dr. Calamy, reflecting on some Men, whom you know, who condemned others as *Hot-heads*, for preaching against the Faction in the *Popish-Plot-time*, said, *I am very sensible that in this Age we live in, some are so extraordinary Wise and Wary, as to censure and discourage all Men that speak roundly, and act vigorously for the King and Church, as being more forward and busie than is needful; but I am also sensible that if some Men had not shewn more Courage and Honesty, than those prudent Persons, both would have been by this time in far greater Danger than at this present, thanks be to God, they are.*

But now, my Lord, to apologize no longer for *Heat*, (which is good or bad, as the Occasion upon, or the Cause in which it is used,) I appeal to your own Conscience, Whether you do not know among the *Jacobites*, as cool, and as considering Temperers as any you know among your Acquaintance, who yet separate from the Publick upon the same Pretences, which you tell the People some warm Men suggest. I wish, my Lord, for the future you would take the Counsel of *Gamaliel*, and let these Men alone; for if this Counsel, or this Work of theirs, be but the effect of *Heat*, or † *unaccountable Humour*, it will come to naught of it self; but if it be of God, ye cannot overthrow it, though you may persecute them to destruction, lest haply ye be found to fight against God.

I have now given your Grace an occasion to review your *Farewel-Sermon*; in which, by the leave of the Gentlemen of the *Vestry*, I must needs say, I think, you have reasoned very indifferently, and not like your self. And though those Gentlemen, through the great veneration they deservedly had for you, did not perceive the weakness of your Reasoning, yet many others who can distinguish betwixt the Speaker, and what is spoken, did. Nay, I can assure you that some of the weaker Sex were sensible of it: *Madam*, said a Lady to another of great Quality, *You hear what my Lord says; Yes*, saith she, *I have heard what he says as well as your Ladyship, but he hath said nothing to convince me: And if this be all he hath to say, I shall be more confirmed than I was, for I think I am able to answer all that I heard him say.* To this purpose spoke that Noble and most *Venerous Lady*; and I could do no less then tell your Grace of it, that hereafter you may take care to print none but rational Sermons, which it concerns you to do, not only as a Person of most venerable Character, but as a great pretender to Reason, who in a certain time, and place, doubted if the *Bishops then suspended were good Reasoners*, though you could not but grant that they were good Men.

My Lord,

I am your most faithful Monitor, and obedient Servant.

F I N I S.